



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. VIII, 4.

WHOLE NO. 32.

I.—FURTHER NOTES ON THE CIRIS AND OTHER POEMS OF THE APPENDIX VERGILIANA.

It was my hope to find during my stay in Rome a MS of the *Ciris* which should represent an earlier and better recension than we possess. As is well known, and as I have stated in my previous article in this Journal (A. J. P. III 272 sqq.), most of the MSS of the poem are not only late, but full of errors; and the one codex which represents an earlier and better recension, Brussels 10675, 6, contains a mere fragment, 454-541.

Had I succeeded in this aspiration as well as in the case of the *Culex* (see Cambridge Journal of Philology for 1887, pp. 152-156, 'A Roman MS of the Culex'), I might have been able to clear up some of the disputed passages of the *Ciris* by the indubitable evidence (worth how many hundred conjectures!) of antiquity. But fortune has been less kind here than in the other no less vitiated poem. The MS in the Urbino collection of the Vatican Library (No. 353) has very little that is new or specially good; and the same may be said of a codex in the Palazzo Chigi, from which I made a few excerpts. On the other hand, there is in the Corsini palace a copy of the *Ciris* which, though written not before the sixteenth century, has preserved some fragments of truth which are hopelessly obscured in the rest. The MS is numbered 43 F, III, 21.

Corsini gives vv. 12-14 as follows:

Quod si mirificum genus omnes philosophiam
Mirificum set enim, modo sit tibi uelle libido,
Si mea iam summa patientia pangeret arce.

At first sight the extraordinary apparition of the uncouth and outlandish word *philosophiam* surprised and dismayed me. But on a reconsideration of the whole three verses as written above, I could not but notice that v. 13, in which *set enim* of Cors. represents *secli* or *sedi* of the other MSS, had the merit of explaining what before was unaccountable, the repetition of *mirificum*. It seemed therefore likely to be right. If it was right, it followed that *philosophiam* also might retain some vestige of the true reading. The poet has already, in v. 4, used the word *sophiae* = 'philosophy' or 'science'; and this word I believe has fallen out of v. 12, the fuller form *philosophiam* may have been a gloss originally written above the line or in the margin, and then, when the verse became corrupted, added at the end. I suppose the poet then to have written nearly as follows:

Quod si mirificum sophiae genus omne secutum
(Mirificum set enim, modo sit tibi uelle libido)
Si mea iam summa patientia pangeret arce.

'If I had followed out philosophy in its glorious entirety (for glorious it is, if only thou hast the will to aspire), if at last my patient toil were setting me on the topmost height,' then I would write a philosophical poem embodying the 'long results of science' and dedicated to you.

- 130. For *Nec fuerat* Cors. has *Ni fuerat*.
- 175. Sedibus ex altis *celsi* speculatur amorem Cors.
- 184. Fertur et horribili preceps impellitur *estro* Cors.
- 196. lucosque *sonantis* (not *sonantes*) Cors.
- 205. Candida concessos *ascendis* (changed to *ascendit*) ciris honores Cors., *ascendat* most MSS, *ascendit* Schwabe.
- 284. *crinis* Cors., *crines* most MSS.
- 339. nihil est quod texuit in ordine longum Cors.
- 344. *restinguens* Cors., *restringuens* Chig., *restringens* most MSS.
- 352. Hesperium et uitant (i e. *euitant*) Cors., *uitant* most MSS.
- 487. *sublimen* Cors., *sublimem* most MSS.
- 522. Commotus *tamen* ad superos uolitare puellam, *talem* other MSS.

Since the publication of my article on the Ciris in this Journal (VIII 1-14), two new conjectures on v. 94 have been communicated to me. The first of these is by Prof. Minton Warren: it is to read *aliparia*. The second is by Mr. J. B. Bury, of Dublin, to read *pullaria*. As yet I have not seen Prof. Warren's explanation and

defence of *aliparia*, and can only say that I do not remember to have encountered the word in any Latin glossary. Mr. Bury's *pullaria* seems, I confess, a little unpoetical: a grave defect in this poem, the style of which is rarely homely, and keeps up, very generally, a truly Vergilian elevation of diction and thought. I have myself, since receiving these suggestions, thought of *caltaria*, 'beds of marigolds'; but the occurrence of *calt* in conjunction with *crocus*, in v. 97, makes this impossible.

Mr. Bury has also suggested for *certos*, in 92, *rectos* or *acutos*, and in 481 for *egros*, *Euris*. It is certainly vexing enough that MSS of the *Ciris* should be so rarely forthcoming earlier than the fifteenth century. Meanwhile I can only ask such of my readers as are interested in these questions to be on the lookout for any trace of such MSS. Does Mr. Allen's collection, which contains Scaliger's codex of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, include a copy of the *Ciris* or the *Catalepta*? For the *Catalepta* are equally rare in good MSS, and are, as is well known, hopelessly vitiated, if not beyond restoration, with our present materials.

58:

Illam esse terumpnis quam saepe legamus Ulixi
Candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstribus
Dulichias uexasse rates.

In examining an uncollated but excellent codex of the *Ibis*, in the Library of the Museum of Naples, IV F, 12, I stumbled on a word, or rather a spelling, which may perhaps be thought to throw light on this difficult passage. Ib. 122 is thus written there:

Errūne facies inuidiosa tue.

May not *errumnis* have been the form in which the corrupt *erumpnis* of Cir. 58 was first written? If it was, it is easy enough to understand that it may have been a misreading of *errantis* (ὅς μᾶλα πολλὰ Πλάγχθη). The genitive of course depends on *rates*. At any rate, no explanation which can be thought adequate has yet been given of the construction of *aerumnis*.

220-222:

Quam simul Ogygii Phoenicis filia Carme
Surgere sensit anus, sonitum nam fecerat illi
Marmoreo aeratus stridens in limine cardo.

Urbinas 353 has *somnum*, which with *fuderat* or *uicerat* for *fecerat* gives a much better construction for *illi*. Indeed, could *sonitum fecerat illi* mean 'had raised a sound to wake her' (Carme),

or, on the other hand, 'had sounded to her (Scylla's) approach'? The latter is the less harsh, but the expression would suggest both, and therefore would have been avoided by the poet as ambiguous.

Cul. 60 :

incognita curis
Quae lacerant auidas inimico pectore mentes.

It is impossible to believe *inimico pectore* sound. The verse is an imitation of Lucr. III 994, *Aut alia quauis scindunt cuppedine curae*. Read, therefore,

Quae lacerant auidas nimia cuppedine mentes.

nimia cu became separated from *pedine*, and when the latter was read *pectore*, the former became *inimico*, or the guess was made as a whole. I consider this nearly certain. Similarly *minuta* had become *inimica* in the MSS of Catull. XXV 12.

Priap. III 1-4 :

Hunc ego iuuenes locum uillulamque palustrem
Tectam uimine iunceo caricisque manipulis,
Quercus arida rustica formitata securi
Nutrior magis et magis ut beata quotannis.

W. Wagner vainly defends *formicata*, which is alleged to be the reading of *B*, the *Bruxellensis*. It had once occurred to me that the right reading was *formicata*, 'hewn into an arch,' viz. to receive the statue of the god Priapus; cf. *Siluanæ sacra semicluse fraxino*, epigr. in Meyer's Anth. Lat. 602. But there can be little doubt that Placidus has preserved the right word, *formitata*, in his gloss *Formitat, formitibus exassulat*, 'chipt into shape.' *Nutrior* with *placitam Paci nutrior oliuam* to defend it, may, I think, be right; but much weight must be given to the combined judgment of Scaliger and Ribbeck, who read, the former *Nunc tuor*, the latter *En tuor*. The rest of the verse I would write *magis ut magis sit beata quotannis*.

Priap. II 3 :

Agellulum hunc sinistre tante quem uides.

Ribbeck prints *sinistra et ante*, doubtless believing that he was the first to emend the v. in this way. It is, however, so emended by Hand, *Observationes Criticae in Catulli Carmina*, p. 68 (Lipsiae, 1809), though he abandons it in favor of a different conj. (which I have since found in an early edition), *Agellulum sinistra, tute quem uides*. 'Equidem olim ita conieci: *Agellulum hunc sinistra et*

ante quem uidet (links und vor dir). Sic Cic. Acad. IV 14 (Acad. II 40, 125), sinistra, ante, post.' Most scholars will agree with Ribbeck and Bücheler in considering the earlier conj. the truer. Bücheler has edited these three Priapia in his smaller edition of Petronius, as a supplement to the collection of 81 poems more properly known as Priapia, and has contributed a very valuable paper on the Catalepta to the Rheinisches Museum for 1883.

6-9:

Mihi corolla picta uere ponitur,
 Mihi rubens arista sole feruido,
 Mihi uirente dulcis uua pampino,
 †Mihi glauca oliuo duro cocta frigo.

The above reading of v. 9 is that of the Brussels MS. The other MSS collated by Bährens give:

Mihi glauca oliua duro frigore cocta,

except that for *cocta* the Rehdigeranus has *coacta*.

No MS adds *que* after *mihi*, and I am inclined to accept this as a starting point for reconstructing the v. If, indeed, we could argue from the seeming parallelism of the four verses, 6 corresponding rhythmically to 8, and 7 to 9, we might conclude that *oliua* occupied the same place in 9 as *arista* in 7. Then I would suggest that the intervening word was *caduca* (Paolo Mercato). If the verse ran originally

Mihi caduca oliua cocta frigore,

and by some error of transcription *ca-* was separated from *duca*, we can understand how the truncated syllable was supplemented, and *glauca* took its place. Similarly in Catal. VII 11:

Ite hinc Camenae uos quoque limite } seue (sane *Bruxellensis*),
 lamite }

where the true reading seems to be

Ite hinc Camenae, vos quoque ite, saluete,

it seems *possible* that the supernumerary syllable *lim-* or *lam-* was introduced after *saluete* had been corrupted into *seue*, though it is also *possible* that the *Bruxellensis* has preserved the truth in its reading *iam ite*:

Ite hinc Camenae uosque, iam ite, saluete,

if any one prefers *uosque* (on the strength of Catull. XXXI 13)

to what all good MSS, including the Bruxellensis, of these Priapia give *uos quoque*.

It may, however, seem to some that the above reading of Priap. II 9, *Mihi caduca oliua cocta frigore*, does not satisfy the required definition of time which the three preceding vv. all emphasize : *uere—sole feruido—uivente pampino*. We might then retain the rhythm of 7 by reading

Mihi coacto oliua dura frigore,

to which, however, the elision of the long *o* is some objection.¹

Priap. II 14 :

Teneraque matre mugiente uacula
Deum profundit ante templa sanguinem
Proin uiator hunc deum uereberis
Manumque sursum habebis hoc tibi expedit.
†Parata namque crux uestat mentula
Velim pol inquis.

Teneraque has generally been corrected ; but none of the alterations, including Mercato's *Tremensque*, can be thought satisfactory. I believe it is right. The poet wished to convey the notion of tremulous weakness which belongs to the unformed limbs of the new-born calf. A similar correction of εἰς ἄβατον ὄρος in O. T 719 is rejected by Jebb, who rightly explains the unusual tribrach as *intended* to give a notion of ruggedness. v. 17 does not appear to me conclusively emended, even by Bücheler, who reads

Parata namque trux stat ista mentula.

Is it not possible that at *hoc tibi expedit* the traveller is supposed to break in, taking the words, so to speak, out of the mouth of Priapus and expressing what the god means in his own language? Two MSS give *neque* for *namque*, and for *uestat mentula* others have *estate ementula*.

I propose then to write

‘Parata mene laxet ante mentula ?
Velim pol’ inquis.

ante would mean before committing any sacrilegious theft.

¹ I have assigned the word *caduca* above to Paolo Mercato, not to Heyse, who made it much later. In Cod. IV A 4 of the Brancacciana Library at Naples the v. is emended, *Mihi caduca duro oliua frigore* (as Heyse), and the uir doctus to whom it is assigned appears to be Mercato. The MS seems to belong to the seventeenth century.

Catal. III:

Socer beate nec tibi nec alteri,
 Generque Nocturne putidum caput,
 Tuone nunc puella talis, et tuo
 Stupore pressa rus abibit? ei mihi
 Vt iste uersus usquequaque pertinet
 'Gener socerque, perdidistis omnia.'

Haupt's correction, *ei* for *et*, has found favor with all succeeding German editors. With much deference I venture to think it wrong. (1) *ei* is indubitable in v. 4, *therefore* it is unlikely in v. 3. (2) the MS reading is spirited and forcible. The poet turns in succession to the father and son, to each of whom in a different sense *stupor tuus* is addressed, of course in both cases meaning the son, Nocturnus. Spoken to the father, *stupor tuus* would mean 'your loutish son'; spoken to the son, 'your loutish self.' It is in the former sense that *meus stupor*, 'my loutish friend,' is used by Catullus in the poem *O Colonia*, from which Catalepta III is imitated.

Catal. XI 13-16, Ribb.:

Pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina cartas,
 Carmina cum lingua tum sale Cecropio,
 Carmina quae Pylum, saeculis accepta futuris,
 Carmina sed Pylum uincere digna senem.

vv. 15, 16 are written as above in Urbin. 353, and I think rightly. 'Verses which shall find favor with ages to come and prove worthy to outlive Nestor, but Nestor old,' i. e. at the very end of his life of three generations. This is better than to give *uincere* a double meaning, (1) of surpassing *in eloquence*, (2) in length of duration. The *sed*, which is not in any of Bährens' MSS, is a very real gain, and must, I think, be right. The usage is very common in Martial.

Catal. VI 5-10:

5 Non ego ture modo aut picta tua templa tabella
 Ornabo et puris dona feram manibus;
 Corniger hos aries humilis et maxima taurus
 Victima sacratos sparget honore focos,
 Marmoreusque tibi aut mille coloribus ales
 10 In morem picta stabit Amor pharetra.

This passage, occurring as it does in a poem which Niebuhr rightly eulogized as the most graceful of the Catalepta, presents several points of doubt. Burmann changed *et* in 7 to *set*, and *hos* to *haud*.

The latter emendation is, I think, questionable ; *set*, on the other hand, seems demanded by the antithesis, *humilis uictima aries set maxima taurus*. The poet means, *not* that he will offer the noblest of victims and not anything so insignificant as a ram, but that he will offer *both*, the lowly oblation of a ram, the noblest of victims, a bull. It is quite true that Paulus says, p. 126, *M. maximam hostiam ouilli pecoris appellabant* : but we need not suppose the poet to use technical language ; in contrast to the largest victim that could be sacrificed, a bull, it would be natural to call a ram *humilis uictima*, and the antithesis could hardly have been expressed more concisely than by the collocation *aries humilis set maxima taurus uictima*. To take *humilis* as accusative is to accumulate epithets unnecessarily (*humilis—sacratos—focos*) and spoils the perfection of the poem ; the fact which Bücheler has noticed in his paper on the Catalepta, that Vergil has *et maxima taurus uictima*, G. II 146, can hardly be thought conclusive against *set*.

v. 9 is still quite conjectural. Ribbeck accepts Heinsius' *dea* for *aut* and writes the whole thus :

Marmoreusque tibi, dea, mille coloribus ales.

This is elegant, though the construction of the abl. *mille coloribus* is a little strained if taken with *ales* = ' *alas habens mille colorum*.' Even more doubtful is *dea* for *aut*. It adds to our uncertainty that two very good MSS, the Rehdigeranus and Arundel 133, give *digne* for *mille*. Arundel 133 has

Marmoreasque tibi aut digne coloribus ales.

Possibly, then,

Marmoreusque tibi *caput*, ignicolorius alas,
In morem picta stabit Amor pharetra.

The head of Amor was to be of glistening white marble, the wings flame-colored, the quiver brightly painted. For *ignicolorius* compare *uersicolorius* of Nemesianus, Ecl. IV 68. It is, of course, equally possible that *ignicoloribus alis* is what the poet wrote.

Copa 7. This v. is thus written in Bembo's codex (saec. IX),

Sunt topia et kalibes cyati rosa tibia corde ;

in another, also early, Vatican codex,

Sunt thephia et kalibes.

Other MSS give *topia* or *copia*. None of the conjectures I have seen really correspond in form to this odd word, *cuppae*, *obbae*, etc.; while *topia*, which Ribbeck prints, is out of place. At least, as a combination, paintings of ornamental garden scenes (if this is the meaning of *topia*) accord rather oddly with cups and drinking vessels. *Thephia* gives, I believe, the right clue. The word lurking under these many disguises is *scaphia*, 'drinking-bowls,' a Greek term found more than once in Plautus. If this is so, we shall have little difficulty in recognizing *kalibes* as also Greek *καλέβαι*. The form is slightly changed, but the word looks unmistakable.¹

27, 28 :

Nunc cantu crebro rumpunt arbusta cicadae
Nunc fuere in gelida sede lacerta sedet.

For *uere* Haupt conj. *ueprum*. I should prefer *uepris*. Hor. Epp. I 16, 9, *Corna uepres et pruna ferant*.

33 :

Formosum tenerae decerpens ora puellae,

obviously *Per morsum*. Oudendorp's *Fer morsum* is hardly very good Latin, but in the main point agrees with my view, which indeed it did not require an Oedipus to discover.

35, 36 :

Quid cineri ingrato seruas bene olentia sarta?
Anne coronato uis lapide ista tegi?

ista conveys no clear meaning. Perhaps a nominative feminine (*urna* or *olla*) was the original word. 'Why keep your fragrant garlands for the unrequiting ashes of the tomb? would you be a potful of embers covered in with a garlanded headstone?'

I now come to the most difficult poem of the whole Vergilian opuscula, the *Aetna* alone excepted; I mean the *Dirae*, usually, and it would seem rightly, ascribed to Valerius Cato. As a composition it has some merits, and was no doubt originally arranged in corresponding sections, though the actual divisions elicited by Goebbel and Ribbeck do not carry conviction. As in the 62d

¹ I will not, however, deny that palaeographical considerations might seem to point almost equally to *strophia*, an ancient word for a simple kind of garland, Plin. H. N. XXI 2, quoted by Ilgen on Cop. 32, *tenuioribus coronis utebantur antiqui, strophia appellantes, unde nata strophiola*. For the margin of Bemb. gives *trophii* for *topia* in v. 7, while in 32 the Leyden MS V gives *trophio*. It is strange enough that I have not found either *scaphia* or *strophia* suggested for 7 by any previous critic, though Heyne mentions it as a v. l.

poem of Catullus, *Vesper adest, iuuenes*, the indubitable loss of some verses makes the problem of reconstruction unusually difficult. It has had the good fortune to be edited by one of the most erudite scholars of this century, Näke, whose Greek, especially his Callimachean studies, were an excellent training for the no less difficult task of elucidating the corrupt text of the *Dirae*. Despite Näke's diligence, judgment, and learning, much yet remains doubtful; and this must be my excuse for going somewhat more into detail than in the rest of this notice in speaking of a MS of the poem.

The codex in question is Vat. Lat. 3269. It was written in the fifteenth century. It contains Catullus, Elegia in Maecenatem, Rosetum, Copa, hexameters from Apollinaris Sidonius, *Dirae*. At the end of the Elegia in Maecenatem is written *Finit elegia inuenta ab enoc in dacia*, whence it will be seen to be identical with the MS described by Tycho Mommsen in Rhein. Mus. VI, p. 628. Tycho Mommsen there shows that by Dacia is meant Denmark, and that the MS must have come from the monastery of Sorø or Sora in Seeland. For this reason I carefully collated the Elegy on Maecenas with the MSS whose readings are given by Bährens in Vol. I of his *Poetae Latini Minores*, and found that the source which Enoch of Ascoli copied was obviously uninterpolated, though it rarely presented variants of any marked importance. I think it probable that Enoch copied the *Dirae* also from the same Danish MS; at any rate, there are reasons for believing that it was not transcribed from an ordinary source. For before the text of the poem begins, the following three verses are written:

Bactare cygneas tibi dixit carmine uoces

Cum pat' in primo luserit ore maro

Hoc alit' diras confertur bactare carmen,

and in explanation is written horizontally along the right margin of the page,

Epigramma uirgilii . po. in libello ad bactarum,

where .po. evidently stands for *poetae*. As to the meaning of the 'epigramma,' it is difficult to speak confidently. The first two vv., however, seem to contrast a youthful '*dirae*' of Vergil's (reading *puer* for *pater*) with some other poem. If this is the *Lydia* which forms the second half of the *Dirae*, and is not separated from it in the MSS (neither in Bembo's of the ninth century nor

the nearly coeval three in the National Library of Paris), we might read v. 3 of the epigram thus,

Hoc aliut diris confertur, Battare, carmen,

and suppose that the writer of the 'epigramma' in this way intimated that the *Lydia* was really a separate poem. Be this as it may, it is clear that the 'epigramma' was copied into Vat. 3269 from some earlier source, and it is a reasonable inference that that source was the same codex from which Enoch copied the Elegy on Maecenas.

As no judgment can be formed of the value of this hitherto uncollated MS without a complete exhibition of its readings, and as there are very few poems in which even a gleam of new light can be more welcome, I will begin by exhibiting these readings, and will then comment on such of them as seem to offer anything unusual or of importance. I number the vv. according to the edition of the *Dirae* in Bährens' PLM II, p. 73 sqq., as Ribbeck's transpositions make his text less convenient in this poem for purposes of reference.

1 cygneas. 2 diuersas. 3 Dura diris uoto. 4 rapiant edi-
uitulique leones. 5 fugient nymbos aquileque columbas. 6 glisset.
7 Multa prius fient quam non sit mea. 8 facta ligurge. 9 steriles-
cant. 11 pturient. 14 inpetamus. 15 effectas cereris sulcis con-
damus auenas. 17 Qmatura. 18 ec siluis. 19 Nec al. quam.
20 Nec ueneris. 21 tingit auena. 23 Murent (? Mutent) terra.
24 non auribus. 26 Lusimus. 27 uire & is. 28 Tu demum
uirides umbras non leta comantes. 29 molles. 31 Impia cum
militis succedit. 32 cadant. 33 Ipse cades ueteris. 34 Nec quic-
quam nostris potuit. 35 aereis flagrabat. 36 Iupiter hanc
coluit¹ cui hoc tibi. 37 Tracis tum in mania. 38 Purus. 39
imineat minantibus. 40 ciano resplendes etere silua. 41 Non
iterum dices crebro tua lidia dixi. 42 flame. 43 om. 44 arbor.
45 Partita metita est ipsa. 46 tat. 47 ut nostris superet. 48
Undique que v̄ris lictora linphis. 49 Lictoraque dulcis. 51 per-
fundit. 52 uulganus agros pastōs iouis ignibus arcet. 53 libiē.
54 p̄uocasti. 55 dicent. 57 corpora. 58 Hec agat infesto returnus
ceca tridendi. 60 cauis exauriat. 61 Di cāt ferrum. 63 neturne
tuis infundimus aris. 65 tibi flumina semper amica. 66 Nil est
quod perdam ulterius meritis omnia ditis (*I think, rather than*

¹ Coluit, I think, rather than *aliut*.

diris or dicis). 67 currentes nymphas. 68 cursim. 69 Incursant remantibus. 70 Nec nostros exite sinant erroribus agros. 72 Ec maneant. 74 occupet arguti grilla cana garrola rana. 76 montibus umbre. 77 diffuse. 78 Qui dominis infesta minantes stagna relinquunt. 79 Unde lapsa. 82 pratorum crimina. 84 in damnatus. 87 Hinc ybo ostabunt. 88 obstanbunt campos audire licebit. 89 et libia. 91 Tardius ah. 93 Tu quoque resiste pater et prima nouissima om uobis. 94 manet estus in illis. 96 Siue eris etsinon mecum morieris utrumque. 99 Candida nigra oculis certant lecia. 100 Nigrabunt cūas. 102 Quamuis nix aderit. 103 licebit nullum spatium ante uers 1 *Lydiae*. *Lyd.* 2 Hęc formosa magis mea quam. 3 Ec uobis rather than et uobis. (*This point I examined carefully again and again, and after many fluctuations of opinion, ended with the belief expressed above.*) 5 alloquitur uobis arridet. 6 summissa. 7 cantabit. 9 multumque beati. 10 ponit. 12 Dulcis namque timet. 13 uenerem stipantia. 14 declinarit teneramque illiserit. 15 furtim narrabat. 18 Tardabunt uiri labentes sistite nimphę. 22 Et male tabescant. *With this v. the MS ends.*

NOTICEABLE VARIANTS IN VAT. 3269.

5. *Delphini fugient nimbos*. All the early MSS *pisces*, rightly, I imagine, as Homer's simile, Il. XXI 22, seems to be imitated :

ὥς δ' ὑπὸ δελφίνος μεγακήτεος ἰχθύνες ἄλλοι
φεύγοντες πιμπλᾷσι μυχοῦς λιμένος εὐόρμου
δειδιότες μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει ὄνκε λάβρην,

and the rest of the v., *aquilae ante columbus*, is thus more symmetrical. But *nimbos* of Vat. 3269 does not look like an interpolation, and may conceivably have been an early variant. Dolphins gamboling in and out of the waves are often mentioned as a sign of wind and stormy weather, Luc. V 551, 2, *Sed mihi nec motus nemorum, nec litoris ictus, Nec placet incertus qui prouocat aequora delphin*. The scholia on the Aratia of Germanicus mention among the signs of increasingly stormy weather, *cum delphini totos se saltibus ostendunt aut caudis aquam feriunt. Nam semper inde uentus oritur quo illi feruntur* (p. 270 ed. Breysig).

26. *Lusimus*, not *Ludimus* as the other MSS. The true reading seems to be *Lusibus*. Here then our MS is less remote from correctness than much earlier codices.

28. *Tu demum*, not *Tundemus* or *Tondemus*. Here the right reading is utterly uncertain. I will only claim for Vat. the merit of suggesting a new and quite different view of the passage :

Lusibus et multum nostris cantata libellis
Optima siluarum, formosis densa uirectis,
Tu(m) demum uirides umbras non laeta comantes
Iactabis molles ramos infantibus auris,
Militis impia cum succaedet dextera ferro
Formosaeque cadent umbrae.

Tum demum is answered by *cum*. 'Kind wood that my verse has often sung, on that day shalt thou toss to the gales that blow music into thy (*ramos infantibus*) soft-swaying branches, no leafy luxuriance of green shade, when the soldier's sacrilegious hand shall hew thee down with the axe and that lovely shade shall fall.'

34-36 are thus written in Vat. :

Nec quicquam nostris potuit deuota libellis
Ignibus aethereis flagrabat Iupiter ipse
Iupiter hanc coluit cui (*read cinis*) hoc tibi fiat oportet.

If, which I must leave it to the general verdict of scholars to decide, these readings are drawn from an originally uncorrupted source, they again suggest a new line of interpretation. Taken consecutively, the verses as above written have no meaning. But they may be fragmentary. Then the outline may have been to this effect: 'Cursed by my song, the soldier's hand availed not to its task. The wood was under the care of Jove, and Jove's fire must consume it; even as of old, Semele, Jove's love, was killed by Jove's lightning.' On this interp. I should suppose the section to have contained originally some verses more than the MSS have preserved; a very common phenomenon in Latin poetry. It could not have begun with *Nec quicquam*, before which one v. may have fallen out. Similarly before 35, one or perhaps more verses are lost, in which the comparison of Semele's burning with the burning of the wood, both alike by fire from Jupiter, the god who originally had fostered both, and whose will it is that neither should perish by the hand of man, was introduced. To make my meaning clear I add a conjectural supplement :

[Deficit incassum, non perfert dextera ferrum,]
Nec quicquam nostris potuit deuota libellis.
[At non Cadmeis, Semele, pia cura Tonantis,]
Ignibus aethereis flagrabat? Iupiter (ipse
Iupiter hanc coluit) cinis haec tibi fiat oportet.

I am well aware of the difficulties attending the above view, but they can hardly be greater than those of the received readings and interpretation, even as expounded by Näke.

53. libię Vat., libicę other MSS. Whether *Libye* (nom.) or *Libyæ* (genitive) is read, this v. l. is in either case worthy of consideration. Can it be shown that *Libycus* was used by any poet before Vergil?

54. preuocasti Vat., reuocasset most MSS. Again Vat. is very near the true reading *reuocasti*, yet sufficiently far from it to make a theory of interpolation impossible.

66.

Nil est quod perdam ulterius meritis omnia ditis.

This last word is written obscurely; I have expressed above my final conviction, formed after several perusals. Here, at any rate, I think the MS gives light. I would read, following its suggestion:

Nil est quod perdam } ulterius, maris omnia, diris.
quo pergam }

'My curse has reached its utmost limit: everything is now part of the sea.' The whole of the ground is supposed to have become sea-water under the poet's curse.

69.

Incursant amnes passim ¹rimantibus undis
Nec nostros exite sinant erroribus agros.

Here again Vat. may be more nearly right than most MSS. After *currentis nymphas* in 67, *Incurrens* in 69 has an air of weakness. *Incursant* would avoid the tautologous effect, and is in itself a better word, indeed almost demanded by *passim* and *rimantibus*. All MSS seem to agree in giving *erroribus*, and only Bemb. m. pr. has *seruire* for *exire*; moreover, the correction *exire* seems to be from the m. pr. And can *erronibus* be thought classical? At any rate, the majority of MSS may here outweigh the first hand of Bemb., 'and let them not suffer my fields to escape their wandering waters.'

94. manet estus in illis. Neither Ribbeck nor Bährens mentions this variant. It cannot, however, be right; the Bemb. and all the early Paris MSS give *esses in illis*, which ought to be what Bährens' M actually gives, *esse sine illis*. Bährens retains this, but spoils it by changing *manet* to *mene*? An indignant question is here not in place, but a regretful expression of resignation, such as *manet esse sine illis*, 'henceforth they are ours no more,' or 'it is

our fixed doom to be robbed of them for the future,' is in perfect harmony with the general tone.

102.

Quamuis nix aderit, quamuis aqua, semper amabo.

This reading of Vat. is in every way inferior to that of most MSS :

Quamuis ignis eris, quamuis aqua, semper amabo,

a fine idea, which recalls Wordsworth's

No motion has she now or force,
She neither hears nor sees,
Rolled round in earth's diurnal course
With rocks and stones and trees.

Lyd. 13.

Aut inter uarios uenerem stipantia flores
Membra reclinarit.

Stipantia seems to me preferable to *spirantia* of Eichstadt, (1) as nearer to *stupentia*, the reading of B. m. pr., *stipendia* of most others; (2) as giving a recondite, but apposite, sense. Properly, the flowers press close about (*stipant*) the limbs; conversely, the limbs are here said to press their gracefulness (*uenerem stipare*) against the flowers that inclose them.

18. *Sistite* Vat., *currite* other MSS. *Currite* must in any case be wrong, and the commonly accepted version,

Tardabant riui labentes currere lymphae

is weak, to say nothing of the excessive iteration of the same verb. A word which recurs often in a poem is apt to be copied by mistake where it does *not* occur; *sistite*, then, may be right; *uiri* of Vat. seems a mere slip of the pen.

I reserve for the last point a curious question which Vat. suggests. In Dir. 18 it appeared to me to give *ec siluis*; in 72, more clearly, *ec maneat*; in Lyd. 3 *ec uobis* rather than *et uobis*. In each case it was an abbreviation; and as I am rather incredulous on this point of *ec* (it is well known that Ribbeck has largely introduced *ec* into Latin poetry, and he has been more than once criticised for so doing), I took much trouble and pains to arrive at a correct opinion as to what the scribe of Vat. meant. To be more certain, I sent the MS back and re-examined it a month later. My final impression was that *ec*, not *et*, was intended; and, if this is so, I venture to think that the source of Vat. must be *very* early, for it has quite fallen out of Bemb. and the early Paris codices.

The above review of the readings of Vat. 3269 gives my own personal impressions. But these impressions are formed without Näge's commentary by me to compare with them, and it is not impossible that other philologists will form an entirely different opinion on the goodness or badness of particular variants. Thus I see from Goebbel's pamphlet, *de Dirarum Compositione*, 1865, that Näge stumbles over *Quamuis ignis eris, quamuis aqua*, which to me has always seemed natural and felicitous, as a harsh and unusual expression. To transpose the v. with Goebbel I hold to be a dangerous experiment; meanwhile, Näge's doubt gives a new interest to the v. l. of Vat. *Quamuis nix aderit, quamuis aqua*, which we might paraphrase in the homely words, 'I love you in all weathers.'

But to form an adequate judgment of this unique codex will require a further examination, I mean of the *Elegia in Maecenatem*, which is expressly stated to have been copied by Enoch. I reserve this to another time.

Lyd. 70, 71:

Nam certe Vulcanus opus faciebat, et illi
Tristi turpabatque mala fuligine barbam.

Scaliger's version of v. 71,

Tristi turpabat malas fuligine barba,

is objectionable, (1) as not accounting for *que*, (2) as circumstantially curious. We must then suppose that the beard *communicates* its sooty hue to the cheeks.

I prefer to regard *que* as caused by a transposition of the two first words of the v. The poet wrote,

Turpabat *strictura* mala fuligine barbam.

ROBINSON ELLIS.